

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 6-52 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicants graciously acknowledge that claims 5, 25-30, and 34-35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Claims 1-4, 6-24, 31-33, and 36-52 stand rejected on prior art grounds. Claims 1, 20-22, 31-41, and 43 are amended herein to incorporate the limitations of allowable dependent claims. Claim 4-5 are canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

I. The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 18-19, 33, 40, 43-45, 47, 49, and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over "Riganati", et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,435,147) hereinafter referred to as Riganati. Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Riganati, in view of Mehtre, article entitled "FINGERPRINT IMAGE ANALYSIS FOR AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION." Claims 8-9, 11-17, 20-24, 31-32, 36-39, 41-42, 46, 48, and 50-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Riganati, in view of Califano, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,041,133), hereinafter referred to as "Califano". Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Riganati, in view of Omori (U.S. Patent No. 5,524,161). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

The claimed invention, as provided in amended independent claims 1, 36-41, and 43 contain features, which are patentably distinguishable from the prior art references of record. Specifically, amended independent claims 1, 39, 40-41, and 43 incorporate the limitations of the allowable subject matter identified in claims 4 and 5 (now canceled). Likewise, amended independent claim 36 incorporates the limitations of the allowable subject matter identified in claims 23 and 25. Similarly, amended independent claim 37 incorporates the limitations of the allowable subject matter identified in claims 23 and 26. Furthermore, amended independent claim 38 incorporates the limitations of the allowable subject matter identified in claims 23, 24, and 28.

Moreover, the Applicants note that all claims are properly supported in the specification and accompanying drawings, and no new matter is being added. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

II. Formal Matters and Conclusion

With respect to the rejections to the claims, the claims have been amended, above, to overcome these rejections. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections to the claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-3, and 6-52, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.


09/872,423

21

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary. Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 09-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 7, 2005



Mohammad S. Rahman
Registration No. 43,029

Gibb Intellectual Property Law Firm, LLC
2568-A Riva Road, Suite 304
Annapolis, MD 21401
Voice: (301) 261-8625
Fax: (301) 261-8825
Customer Number: 29154